

**REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated September 7, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1, 9, and 10 are hereby amended. Accordingly, claims 1–12 are currently pending, with claims 5–8 being withdrawn from consideration. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4, 9, 10, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,726,802 to Ono et al. (hereinafter “Ono”); and claims 3 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ono.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4, 9, 10, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ono. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of independent claim 1 and request reconsideration. Independent claim 1 is allowable in that it recites “a storage capacitor having a lower storage electrode across the data line and in parallel with the gate line on the same layer as the gate line, wherein the lower storage electrode divides the pixel region into two sub-regions, and a semiconductor layer interposed between the lower storage electrode and the pixel electrode.” Nothing in Ono teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, and its dependent claims 2 and 4, are allowable over Ono.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of independent claim 9 and request reconsideration. Independent claim 9 is allowable in that it recites “a semiconductor layer formed on the lower storage electrode,” “a pixel electrode on the protection layer, wherein the pixel electrode contacts the top of the semiconductor layer,” and “a lower storage electrode ... wherein the lower storage electrode is parallel to the gate line and divides the pixel region into two sub-regions.” Nothing in Ono teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 9, and its dependent claims 10 and 12, are allowable over Ono.

In the Office Action, claims 3 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ono. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 3 and 11 and request reconsideration. Claims 3 and 11, which depend from independent claim 1, are allowable because Ono does not teach or suggest at least the feature of claim 1 discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 3 and 11 are allowable over Ono.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: December 6, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes <sup>Reg. No. 59,005</sup>  
for Eric J. Nuss  
Registration No.: 40,106  
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorneys for Applicant